



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

our Saviour "when instituting this sacrament." If he will examine this more closely, he will see that, of the three passages he has quoted, these words only, "this is my body," were spoken at the institution; all the rest were spoken on another occasion, at least a year before the sacrament was instituted. It is, therefore, a question whether these words were spoken of the institution, since they were certainly not spoken at it. Now, it is well known that the Fathers differed about this; and the Council of Trent admits that they differed, for the Council says (Session 21, ch. 1)—"Neither from that discourse, in the sixth of John, is it rightly gathered that the partaking of both kinds (bread and wine) was commanded by the Lord; however, it (the discourse) may be understood according to the various interpretations of the holy Fathers and doctors." So the case stands thus: the Fathers differed about whether this discourse was spoken of the institution: we have not, therefore, "the unanimous consent of the Fathers" to interpret this Scripture. The Council of Trent and the Pope could not say which opinion was right; we have, therefore, no guidance here from the infallible judge; and so Roman Catholics and Protestants must form their opinion alike from private judgment on this question, or else they can have no opinion about it at all. We suggest to our friend this way of forming an opinion—Our Saviour said, "If **ANY MAN** eat of this bread **HE** shall live for ever." Now, our correspondent will admit that **this is not true** of the consecrated bread in the sacrament. Judas ate of that bread, and perished for ever; many a wicked man eats of it, and perishes for ever; but our Saviour's words **ARE** true of himself as the bread of life. Therefore, we apply his words to that of which they are true, and not to that of which they are not true; we think that he spoke not of that bread blessed in the sacrament, but that spiritual nourishment which Christ gives to those who faithfully use that sacrament which he has appointed for them.

Our correspondent also quotes from the early Fathers, in support of that view of transubstantiation which we invited Roman Catholics to disclaim. We treat such an argument with respect, though we do not submit to it as infallible; nor do we suppose he produces it as such; for we are sure any person of learning and candour must admit, that many errors might be supported by quotations from Fathers. Still, we give the argument a respectful consideration.

The first step in such an examination is, to inquire carefully whether the Fathers did really say what is attributed to them. We do not, for a moment, suppose that our correspondent would willingly put forward anything, as coming from Augustine or Ambrose, which he knew was not really theirs: but experience has taught us the necessity of such an inquiry; and we think he will see it himself in a new light after hearing what we have to say.

Three of his quotations, out of five, are from St. Ambrose. Now, Du Pin, a French Roman Catholic divine, whose learning rendered him one of the best judges that ever lived of such a question as this, says, in his account of ecclesiastical writers (vol. i., fourth century, St. Ambrose)—"The works of St. Ambrose, above all the other Fathers, have been most corrupted in the ordinary editions. The Roman edition, from which those that followed after were made, instead of restoring the text of this Father, hath rendered it more faulty in many places, by the liberty which the supervisors of that edition took, of making alterations in it by their own authority." In quoting St. Ambrose we should, therefore, be very careful to use the best edition, which is that made by the learned Benedictine monks.

Our correspondent, however, has quoted St. Ambrose and St. Augustine, from the Decretum of Gratian. We do not wonder at this: it was most natural for him to do so. A commission of cardinals and others was appointed, by Pope Gregory XIII., to correct the Decretum; and the Pope confirmed the book so corrected by a Bull (A.D. 1580), and made it an integral part of the Roman Canon Law. No wonder that it should be regarded as a book of high authority, on which we might safely rely. Yet it is confessed, by learned men in the Church of Rome, that Gratian was most careless and incompetent in giving the real authors of the passages he quotes. Not only this, but he quoted numberless passages from letters said to have been written by early Popes, which letters are gross forgeries. Nearly all Gratian's authorities for the supremacy of the Pope (for instance) are taken from these forgeries: and the cardinals who corrected, and the Pope who confirmed the book, took no notice of this; yet it is now admitted, to the fullest extent, by every Roman Catholic writer on the subject. It is evident, therefore, that quotations from the Decretum cannot be admitted as coming from the Fathers to whom Gratian attributes them, without some further inquiry.

Our correspondent's first quotation is taken from the Decretum (*De Consecr.*, Dist. 2, c. 55), where Gratian professes to take it from St. Ambrose, and refers to the book *De Sacramentis*, lib. iv., c. 4 and 5. The latest and best edition of the Canon Law, by Richter, published at Leipzig, 1839, 4to, has a brief and forcible note on this quotation—"Non est Ambrosii"—"It is none of Ambrose's." The learned Benedictine editors give a

candid examination of the evidence whether this book were written by Ambrose, and decide it in the negative; among other reasons, because Ambrose never wrote in so mean a style, nor ever used the cold and childish interrogations of which the book is full. (See Du Pin, as before referred to.) There can be no doubt that this passage was written by some obscure person in the eighth or ninth century, and that Gratian mistook it for St. Ambrose's.

The second passage which our correspondent quotes is to be found *De Consecr.*, Dist 2, c. 74. It is taken from the same book, on the sacraments, which St. Ambrose did not write; at least Richter says in his note that there are "things like it" in that book, for it would seem he could not find the passage itself even there. The learned Berhard, whose book on the *Decretum* we shall notice presently, says—"Canon 74 is not found in Ambrose, although it is praised by Gratian, under the name of Ambrose"—Vol. iv., p. 108. Our correspondent gives it thus—"Although the SPECIES of bread and wine are visible," &c. We think our correspondent has made a mistake in transcribing here; the Latin word is "figura," not "species." We have looked in the splendid original edition of Eggesteyn, Argent, 1471; in the small Paris edition of 1538; in the Roman edition, corrected by the cardinals and approved by the Pope; and in Richter; and in all the word is "figura." If any edition had "species," Richter would notice it, which he does not. The word makes a great difference: *species* might mean that there was only the *appearance*, *not the reality of bread*; but "figura," means that the bread is a *FIGURE* of Christ's body, not the body itself; and so the passage means, that when we see this *figure*, we are to take hold of the *thing itself* by faith, which is Protestant doctrine.

The third passage which our correspondent quotes he attributes to St. Augustine: we do not know on what authority. In the place of the *Decretum* which he refers to, it is attributed to St. Jerome in all the editions mentioned above. But no such passage has ever been found in any of St. Jerome's works. The cardinals appointed by the Pope to correct the *Decretum*, say that they found it in a *Missal* which they attribute not to St. Augustine, but to St. Ambrose. But all who understand such matters, know how impossible it is to attribute a *Missal* to any individual with certainty. The learned Berhard, in his most valuable work, "In Canones Gratiani," vol. iv., p. 115 (Venice, 1777), says—"It is rather to be referred to a certain *Missal*;" and this is all that can be said of it with truth. We do not altogether agree in our correspondent's translation here: he says—"Each receives Christ the Lord entire in each particle;" the Latin is—"Singuli accipiunt Christum Dominum et in singulis portionibus totus est," &c.—"Each receive Christ the Lord, and he is whole in each portion." We see nothing in the Latin to make us apply this to the *particles of the bread*, but to the portion of Christ which each receives at the sacrament. All receive Christ equally and wholly.

The next passage quoted by our correspondent, and attributed to St. Ambrose, is from the same place in the *Decretum* (c. 55), and the same place in the book, *De Sacramentis*, from which his first was taken, of which we have already spoken.

Therefore it appears that *none* of these quotations are the genuine writings of the persons whose names they bear. All are the opinions of obscure writers in much later ages, which have been mistaken for the writing of the Fathers, but which are really of no weight at all.

We have been particular in our examination of these passages, because we think that much mischief has been done in this controversy for want of such attention. The Fathers have not had fair play, when the works of obscure and mean writers have been allowed to pass under their names. The light which the genuine writings of the early Fathers can throw upon such questions has thus been greatly obscured, and controversy has been made more dark, instead of more clear. We thought it our duty to take this opportunity of pointing out such an evil; but we do it with the greatest respect to our correspondent, feeling that he had great apparent reason to rely on the *Decretum* as he did, and that his letter affords a truly important subject for discussion. We shall be happy to hear from him again, and, in the meantime, we trust he will reconsider our notice of transubstantiation in our last number, and inquire whether Roman Catholics are really willing to admit it, as there stated.

ON CONCOMITANCY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR.—As you say "We invite Roman Catholics to come forward and disclaim whatever they think is unjustly charged on their religion, and place our pages at their disposal for the purpose," I beg to stand forward, in the name of thousands of Roman Catholics in Ireland, and deny boldly and explicitly the doctrine of transubstantiation as explained in your last number.

1st. Roman Catholics do not believe that the consecrated bread is changed into the *blood* of Christ, but they do believe that it is changed into his *body*, and that, by concomitancy, where the body is the blood

must be also. As there was nothing before consecration but bread, which cannot be transubstantiated into blood, the blood of Christ must, of course, come down from heaven to accompany the body on the altar into which the bread has been transubstantiated. Protestants will ridicule this doctrine of concomitancy, and profanely ask—"Does the body come down from the right hand of God along with the blood, or does the blood leave the body above, that it may accompany the body below?" Such questions all true Roman Catholics are not careful to answer. They merely wish to deny that there is any necessity for the *divine body* of Christ to come down from above, as the bread on the altar is really changed into that very body which sits at the right hand of God; but they acknowledge that there is a necessity for the blood to come down, in order to fulfil the law of concomitancy, and therefore they humbly, faithfully, and piously believe that it does so come down, notwithstanding the profane objections of the adversaries. Protestants will again absurdly and impiously inquire—"When the blood leaves the Divine body in heaven, to unite himself with the body on the altar, into which the bread has been transubstantiated, does it leave that heavenly body bloodless above?" Again, permit me to say, no true and faithful Roman Catholic is anxious to satisfy such inquiries. I may, however, observe, that there is nothing absurd, but rather according to true doctrine in the belief that, although the whole blood must leave the body above to unite itself to the body on the altar, yet the whole blood still remains in the body above by the same law of concomitancy. If you will prove yourself so impartial as to insert the above, I may, perhaps, continue my observations in a following number.

And am, Sir,
Yours faithfully,

CATHOLICUS.

It is for Roman Catholics, not for us, to say whether the above answer will satisfy them. It does not satisfy us.

At the same time we beg to say that we do not "ridicule" the doctrine of "concomitancy," neither do we "profanely ask" the questions which our correspondent attributes to Protestants. We do not "ridicule" any doctrine of the Roman Catholic faith, nor do we assume that any doctrine **must** be false because our reason does not comprehend *how* it can be true. But we do bring all doctrines to the test of Divine revelation, and ask whether God has revealed them; if he have, we accept them with faith.

The doctrine of "concomitancy" is thus stated by the Council of Trent:—"Sed Corpus quidem sub specie panis, et sanguinem sub vini specie, ex vi verborum, ipsum antem corpus sub specie vini, et sanguinem sub specie panis, animamque sub utraque, vi naturalis illius connectionis et concomitantia, qua partes Christi Domini, qui jam ex mortuis resurrexit non amplius moritur, inter se copulantur," &c.

"The body of Christ, indeed (exists) under the appearance of bread, and the blood under the appearance of wine, from the power of the words, but the body itself (exists) under the appearance of wine, and the blood under the appearance of bread, and the soul under either, by the power of that natural connection and concomitancy, by which the parts of Christ the Lord, who has now risen from the dead to die no more, are connected among themselves," &c.—Sess. xii., c. 3.

However this doctrine may favour transubstantiation, and receiving in one kind only, it seems to us fatal to the Mass, as a propitiatory sacrifice for sin; for, according to this doctrine, the blood is *not* shed from the body, and cannot be, and yet the Scripture says—"Without shedding of blood there is no remission."—Heb. ix., v. 22, Douay Bible. When Christ died on the cross his blood was *shed*, and this was the sacrifice for the remission of sin. If his blood cannot be separated from his body in the Sacrifice of the Mass, and this doctrine of "concomitancy" affirms that it cannot, then, according to the Revelation of God, the Mass cannot be a sacrifice for "remission," for "without shedding of blood there is no remission."

READING THE SCRIPTURES.

We also freely insert the following letter of Mr. Aylmer, which reached us a few days since. It will afford us an opportunity hereafter of explaining our own views more fully, when discussing those of our correspondent. He will not find that we contend for any such absurdities as that of making a *child* the arbiter of the most important truths; nor shall we contend either that there are no difficulties in the Holy Scriptures, or that they may not be misinterpreted. We know they must have been misinterpreted by Churches as well as children, or men could not so differ about them. To consider the subject as fully as its grave importance deserves, would much exceed the space at our command in our present number; but we hope to recur speedily to both the letter and the pamphlet of our respected correspondent; in the meantime merely expressing our gratification at the frank and independent tone of his communication, as well as the spirit in which it is conceived. Collecting, as we do, from his pamphlet

distinctly, that he "does not put the priest above the Scriptures," and from his letter, that he is "decidedly for Scriptural education," we venture to anticipate, that, however distrustful he may be of his own judgment in interpreting the Bible, his views of the right and duty of exercising private judgment will not be found to differ very widely from our own; and we are glad to find that his view of the passage in St. John, on which he comments, agrees with our own, and with that of St. Chrysostom, and not with that of St. Cyril.

"SIR—My attention has just been directed to the leading article of the last number of your periodical, on the subject of the Church of Rome allowing or preventing the free use of the Holy Scriptures.

"I confess you have treated the matter fairly enough, in showing that the Church, both in ancient and modern times, by no means generally prohibited the reading of the Holy Scriptures—quite the contrary; but I must dissent, in *limine*, to your interpretation of the 39th verse of the 5th chapter of St. John, which I do not at all conceive to be borne out either by the original or your translation from St. Chrysostom.

"My view of the text you will best comprehend by my referring you to page 15 of the accompanying pamphlet,* which, at the suggestion of some friends, was published last summer.†

"There is, however, one observation which escaped my notice at the time; and which is, that there is nothing in the original text of St. John to prove that the word corresponding to 'search' is to be taken in the imperative or the indicative mood. If the latter, your commentary completely falls to the ground. I do not mean to contend for either, as I maintain my interpretation applies equally to both. We, Roman Catholics, translate it imperatively, because most of the Fathers (though not all—St. Cyril, for instance) do so; but Protestants, who disregard tradition, have nothing but the text to guide them; and hence, as Parkhurst observes, some divines of the Church of England have declared for the indicative acceptance of the word.

"The Scriptures, as a sole rule of faith, cannot be otherwise than dangerous; and their indiscriminate reading and circulation most pernicious. Open your Bible, take the first three pages that occur in either Testament, and tell me, without disguise, is there nothing in them too difficult for your comprehension? 'Thine thou that thou understandest what thou readest?'—Acts viii. 30. If you find all before you clear and easy, you may thank God for giving you a privilege which he has denied to so many thousands upon thousands of sincere believers! I am decidedly for Scriptural education, but administered in a proper and convenient form. The most wholesome food may disagree with a delicate stomach; and St. Jerome, who was so zealous an advocate for the reading of the Holy Scriptures, in his letter to Laeta, respecting the education of her granddaughter, recommended her to put them into the hands of this young lady progressively, in proportion as she advanced in years, capacity, and virtue. The Jews themselves, although accustomed to, and familiar with the oriental tropes and figures of speech, yet used precaution with regard to the reading of Holy Writ. They did not allow the first chapters of Genesis, some of Ezekiel, and the Song of Solomon to be read except by those who had attained the age of thirty years. Surely, in sober seriousness, you do not contend for making a child the arbiter of the most important truths! It is neither meet nor just, right nor available to salvation to do so. We know that 'out of the mouths of infants and of sucklings praise can be perfected,' without placing this great maintaining power within their reach. Children could cry in the temple, 'Hosanna to the Son of David,' while those who were 'masters in Israel' were confounded and moved with indignation.—St. Matthew xxi. 15, 16. No doubt, the revealed truths themselves are to be made known as much as possible to all mankind; but it does not follow from hence that all mankind are to read, search, and be everlastingly digging (as you express it) at the Scriptures. Lord Clarendon, the great historian, Mr. Grey, Doctor Hey, &c., all agree, that the misapplication of Scripture was the cause of the destruction of Church and State, and of the murder of the king. So likewise the same cause exposed the nation to great calamities in the Protestant riots of 1780. The same might be affirmed with regard to Joanna Southcott, who declared herself to be the woman of Genesis, destined to *crash the serpent's head*; and the woman mentioned in Revelations, 'clothed with the sun, and crowned with twelve stars'!

"This communication has far exceeded the limits I intended. I have occupied too much of your time; I

shall cease to do so; but let me impress upon you, it is exclusively to guard against such fatal abuse that the Roman Catholic Church prevents an indiscriminate, an independent, and puerile use of the Sacred Volume.

"I am, Sir,
"Your obedient, very humble servant,
"M. V. AYLMER."

ODE FOR ST. PATRICK'S DAY.

This was a day for gladsome glee—

A day to every patriot dear;
But now, unused to sounds of joy,
Tis hallowed by a silent tear.

That God would bless, be still our prayer:
We ask, at least, that Heaven will spare.

Oh! honoured be our Ocean Isle,
Of saintly deeds and faith the scene,
That thousand years have not bedim'd,
In memory's light still fresh and green;
But doubly dear for all the woe
Poured on her withered soil below.

And yet, though quenched her joys in night,
Though sunk her manliest sons in grief,
Celestial comforts, pure and bright,
And guardian spirits with relief,
Can break o'er this drear, wintry state,
To cheer the dark, the desolate.

And, oh! if such communion be
The solace of our wretchedness—
If grovelling minds be raised above,
And hearts be wakened from hopelessness,
Then who will God's high hand deny,
Or say our doom is misery?

Peace be with thee, afflicted Isle!
Though dark the clouds that o'er thee lower,
May Heaven still lend its pillar'd ray,
To guide thee in thy drooping hour;
Thy people cheer with trust sublime,
And raise thee in His own good time!

FARMING OPERATIONS FOR MARCH.

(From the *Irish Farmer's Gazette*.)

MUCH of the weather during last month has been totally against sowing spring wheat, beans, and peas; the early part of this month should, therefore, be almost exclusively devoted to getting in the intended breadths of the above crops, as in a short time it will be getting too late for doing so, when it will be necessary to substitute some other crops, which will be attended with much inconvenience; every exertion will, therefore, be necessary, while the present fine weather lasts, to commit those crops to the ground. At the same time, in cold, backward soils and aspects, it may be safer to substitute oats for the wheat, particularly if the land be not in high condition, and well drained; and, instead of beans, potatoes may be planted, and parsnips, carrots, mangels, and other green crops sown. If the soil be light and dry, peas may still be sown with safety.

Autumn-sown Wheat.—As soon as the land is dry enough, and that this crop has been sown in drills, it will be necessary to hand or horse hoe between the rows, to break the winter's crust, destroy weeds, and mould the young plants. If it be intended to lay down the autumn wheats with clover and grass seeds, whether the wheat may be sown in drills or broadcast, the most suitable implement will be the harrow, which should be followed by the roller; the grass and clover seed sown, lightly but well bush-harrowed, and finished with the roller.

Oats.—In rich, well-prepared, and early soils, oats should be sown early in the month; but in cold, wet, and backward ones, it will be safer to sow by the end of this or early next month. Lea land is very frequently sown under the harrows; and, if clean, the soil deep, dry, and in good heart, and ploughed early, with a good crest or arrass, sufficient to cover the seed, is a very expeditious mode, and produces well; but if the land be foul, light, or inclined to damp, the best crops will be obtained by ploughing into narrow sets; give a stroke of the harrows up and down, sow the seed, harrow finely, and cover from the furrows, cutting them with the furrow-plough, to raise sufficient mould. The most yielding crops are produced from lea by this mode; and the land turns out more cleanly for the succeeding crops, the sods more decomposed, and the land more friable.

Barley may be sown by the end of the month. The most suitable soils for this crop are those of a gravelly or sandy nature, dry and rich. Soils of the above description, having grown a well-manured green crop, are, therefore, best adapted for barley; and soils wanting the above qualities will be more profitably sown with oats, which is by far the hardest grain we have, and not so

easily damaged by bad weather at harvest time. The pickle recommended for wheat is also applicable to oats and barley, and highly useful in preventing smut in those crops.

Spring Vetches.—Sow another breadth of this valuable crop for summer soiling. Sow in the proportion of three bushels of vetches and four to five stones of oats to the Irish acre. When well up, sow another breadth, in order to keep up a continuous succession of succulent forage. About four pounds of rape, sown along with the vetches and oats, will help to keep the former off the ground, and add considerably to the bulk of the crop.

Carrots love a deep, sandy loam, which, when well manured with well-decomposed compost, intimately mixed with it, produces this crop in the highest state of perfection. On this account the best practice is to manure the land heavily in the autumn, and plough it in with a deep, rough furrow; it is then harrowed down as soon as thoroughly dry in the spring, cross-ploughed, well harrowed, rolled, and, if necessary, well grubbed and rolled, so as to reduce it to the finest possible tilth, preparatory to forming the drills, which are then rolled, to flat their tops and consolidate them, and immediately sown. If the land has not been manured in the autumn, it may be manured at the time of sowing; but in this case the manure must be short and well decomposed, and put in the drills, as is usual for turnips. Carrots may be sown from the middle of the month up till the middle of April; but the earlier the better.

Parsnips like a deep, sappy, heavy soil, not wet; and, to produce a heavy crop, it should be rich and well manured with rich compost. The cultivation of the soil is the same as for carrots, and the seed may be sown at the same time; but carrots will produce better, if sown a little later than parsnips.

Cabbages.—Prepare a clean, rich, and well-manured piece of land, and pulverize it well, to sow some cabbage seeds, lay it off in three and a half or four feet beds, with eighteen-inch alleys; level the beds neatly with the back of the spade; sow the seed thinly and evenly, and cover with about an inch of fine earth from the furrows; rake the surface nicely, and, when dry enough, beat it well with the back of the spade, which will prevent it cracking or fissuring. The large York, Nonpareil York, and Drumhead are the best sorts to sow now, for field culture, and will produce fine plants for planting out in May and June.

Flax.—Land intended for flax demands particular attention now. The land should have been deeply ploughed last autumn, and should, as soon as sufficiently dry, be well harrowed, rolled, grubbed, and well cleaned of all root-weeds—such as scutch, crowfoot, &c. The best soil for flax is a deep, strong loam; and rich stubble land, after wheat, oats, or barley, produces the best sample, particularly if the grain crops have succeeded lea; the seed may be grown by the end of the month, and well harrowed with a short-tined harrow, first one way, and then across, or diagonally, so as to distribute the seeds equally; finish with the roller. The proportion of seed generally sown to the Irish acre is three and a half to four bushels; but it is much safer to sow too thick than too thin. Good crops are taken after potatoes, mangels, carrots, and parsnips; but of late there is a decided opinion setting in in the north of Ireland against growing flax after turnips. Professor Hodges, of the Queen's College, Belfast, has recommended the following special manure for the flax crop for the last three years; but we have, as yet, no report as to its efficacy from those who may have tried it. It is said that recent chemical investigations show that the flax crop has taken from the soil those matters which the professor proposed to supply. The quantities are for a statute acre:—

	s. d.
Muriate of potash, 30lb.	cost ... 2 6
Chloride of sodium (common salt), 28lb. ,	... 0 3
Burned gypsum, powdered, 34lb.	" 0 6
Bone-dust, 54lb. ,	" 3 3
Sulphate of magnesia (Epsom salts), 56lb. ,	" 4 0

—This is also recommended to be applied to the land when flax is sown after turnips, from the results of an experiment made by Mr. James Dickson in growing flax after carrots, potatoes, and turnips.

Poultry.—Select and set the eggs of the various fowl intended to increase; put no more than thirteen under the common hen. As soon as the geese eggs, set last month, are hatched, let the young ones have soft meat and plenty of green feeding, but do not let them have too much access to water. The same rule applies to young ducks, for which the hen is a better nurse than the duck. Collect the Turkey eggs as they are produced, and put them by carefully for setting.

Odds and Ends.—Cut turf for fuel. Manufacture peat charcoal to mix with the manures. Repair roads; drain and subsoil, where necessary; scour out ponds, ditches, and water-courses. Level and turn over old, useless banks of fences, and incorporate lime with them for manure. Burn lime, which should be carted out, spread, and harrowed, or ploughed under, in dry weather.

* Speech of M. V. Aylmer, Esq., at the Rotundo Religious Discussion Class. 16th June, 1851.

† In this pamphlet, p. 15, the writer argues that the whole discourse in 5th chap. of John has reference, *exclusively*, to the Jews, to whom it was addressed by our Saviour, on one of their festival days, and relates, of course, to the Scriptures of the Old Testament, which were then alone extant. The Jews were in the habit of reading their Testament, and were referred to it, by our Lord, for the testimony or proof of his Divine mission. We regret that we have not space in our present number to transcribe the whole of his argument. We cannot, however, omit noticing one passage in it, of which we cordially approve:—"Let us take care in what spirit and with what dispositions we read and search the Scriptures."